

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Jackie Arnold Kerce,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No.: 6:09-2643-TLW-WMC
	)	
Nurse Paula Brodie,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

On October 14, 2009, the plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. #1). On February 1, 2010, the defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #28). The plaintiff filed a response in opposition on February 18, 2010. (Doc. #33). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge William M. Catoe pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), DSC.

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #45). On April 13, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the defendant’s motion for summary judgment be granted. (Doc. #45). Shortly thereafter, the plaintiff filed a motion for extension of time to file objections to the Report. (Doc. #47). On July 9, 2010, this Court issued an Order giving the plaintiff an additional 20 days to file objections to the Report. (Doc. #50). To date, no objections have been filed by the plaintiff.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept,

reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. #45). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the defendant's motion for summary judgment is hereby **GRANTED**. (Doc. #28).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

August 24, 2010  
Florence, South Carolina